

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/050,001	AGOSTINI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Katarzyna Wyrozebski Lee	1714	

All Participants:

(1) Katarzyna Wyrozebski Lee.

(2) Mr Henry Young.

Date of Interview: 23 March 2004

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 1400

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.


SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's representative with request for examiner's amendment. The amendment included clarifying language in claim 1B2 regarding the two initiators. From the language it was not clear if the initiators were used together or separately. The applicants authorized to change the language of the claim to read "selected from" to further clarify that the two initiators are utilized separately. The applicants further authorized to amend the title of the invention to conform to the requirements of MPEP. .